

Exhibit A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re: :
AVERBACH, et al., : Docket #19cv0004
: 19-cv-00004-GHW-KHP
Plaintiffs, :
- against - :
CAIRO AMMAN BANK, : New York, New York
: October 25, 2022
Defendant. :
----- :

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE
THE HONORABLE KATHARINE H. PARKER,
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs: OSEN LLC
BY: MICHAEL RADINE, ESQ.
DINA GIELCHINSKY, ESQ.
ARI UNGAR, ESQ.
190 Moore Street, Suite 272
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601
For Defendant: DLA PIPER US LLP
BY: JONATHAN SIEGFRIED, ESQ.
ANDREW PECK, ESQ.
ERIN COLLINS, ESQ.
MARGARET CIVETTA, ESQ.
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020

Transcription Service: Carole Ludwig, *Transcription Services*
155 East Fourth Street #3C
New York, New York 10009
Phone: (212) 420-0771
Email: Transcription420@aol.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;
Transcript produced by transcription service.

INDEXE X A M I N A T I O N S

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Cross</u>	<u>Re- Direct</u>	<u>Re- Cross</u>
None				

E X H I B I T S

<u>Exhibit Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>ID</u>	<u>In</u>	<u>Voir Dire</u>
None				

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

3

THE CLERK: Calling case 19cv004, Averbach versus Cairo Amman Bank. Beginning with the counsel for the plaintiffs, please make your appearance for the record.

MR. MICHAEL RADINE: Good morning, Your Honor, I'm Michael Radine for the plaintiffs. Do you mind if I sit to speak?

THE COURT: No, go right ahead.

MR. RADINE: Thank you. I'm joined by Dina Gielchinsky and Ari Ungar.

THE COURT: Hi, nice to see you.

MR. RADINE: Nice to see you, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: And counsel for the defendants, please make your appearance for the record.

MR. JONATHAN SIEGFRIED: Good morning, Your Honor, Jonathan Siegfried, Andrew Peck, Erin Collins, and Margaret Civetta.

THE COURT: Nice to see everyone. Thank you for coming in on this rainy day, and I have your status letter from October 20. I thought we could go over some of the issues in more detail. The bank has been strongly contesting the basis for jurisdiction, and it seems from the letter that plaintiffs believe that the evidence exchanged thus far supports jurisdiction, but I'd like to

1 hear a little bit more on that.

2 MR. RADINE: Sure, so, well, I can start there.
3 What we've produced to them so far is 118 transactions,
4 our records evidencing those transactions, and then we
5 have about a dozen more that we located that we have
6 informed them of that we are processing to give them
7 shortly, in the next day or so. Of those 118, 101 of
8 those are direct transactions that Cairo Amman Bank
9 processed through its correspondent account at Citibank
10 in New York, and 17 are transactions that appear to have
11 been processed through a nested account they held at Arab
12 Bank where Arab Bank uses its correspondent account in
13 New York to process the transaction.

14 That structure of using a nested account to
15 process a transaction through New York, the
16 jurisdictional relevance of that structure is currently
17 sub judice before the Second Circuit in *Spetner v.*
18 *Palestine Investment Bank* as to whether that meets the
19 *Licci* standard given that another bank is interposed in
20 that flow.

21 But, again, of the 118 we've produced so far,
22 that constitutes 17 of those transactions. The rest are
23 direct transactions.

24 So they are transactions of significant amounts.
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

5

We've produced a spreadsheet to them. I have a copy if
Your Honor would like to see it here.

THE COURT: Sure. If you have it, I'll take a
look.

MR. SIEGFRIED: Your Honor, we have objections
to that since we haven't actually been able to even
verify anything regarding these transactions.

THE COURT: Okay, I mean this is not evidence,
in any case.

MR. SIEGFRIED: I understand it.

THE COURT: So I'm not taking it for any
purpose other than this conversation.

MR. SIEGFRIED: Sure.

MR. RADINE: So this is the spreadsheet we
produced to them, so it does not include the last dozen
that we've located.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RADINE: So the way to read this, obviously
printing Excels is always a bit of a pain.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. RADINE: It goes, if you will, to the right
and down to the right and then down to the right and then
down. So an entire row is expressed over a page and the
next page, if that makes sense.

PROCEEDINGS

6

1 THE COURT: Uh huh.

2 MR. RADINE: So on the top half of the first
3 page here we start with the nested account transactions.
4 So you'll see there should be about 17 of them, and you
5 have the first half of the information on page 1 and the
6 second half on page 2. And then below that with the
7 direct transactions, again, first half on page 1, second
8 half on page 2, and then repeating in that pattern
9 through the other pages.
10

11 So we've asked them if they dispute the accuracy
12 of this, but obviously we're not asking them if they
13 think this is jurisdictionally sufficient, just whether
14 this reflects the evidence we've produced to them.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. RADINE: Now, we understand from them that
17 they do not think that transactional information is
18 sufficient to prove personal jurisdiction on its face.
19 They've asked us what information or evidence we intend
20 to put in at this stage and so on. We're at a bit of a
21 loss as to what that would be under *Licci*. The evidence
22 that relates to personal jurisdiction is transactions
23 for, relating to the terrorist group in question from
24 which the claims arise.

25 So we understand that they've argued that the

evidence, we have not - I'll just quote so I don't misstate it - that we have, quote, "not provided evidence sufficient under the Due Process Clause," close quote, to show, quote, "that the claims in this action arise out of or relate to any transfers processed through its correspondent accounts in New York," close quote, because, they argue, last quote, "transfers involving routine banking transactions and for humanitarian services, for example, do not give rise to claims under JASTA."

So our position is that's a merits question. The law in this case, as Your Honor pointed out in two reports and recommendations, is that the Second Circuit noted that the use of a correspondent account standing alone could be grounds to find personal jurisdiction so long as the use is purposeful. That's from Your Honor's 2020 opinion.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. RADINE: And purposeful, as this Court explained, means repeated and volitional as we argued these were and I think as this chart suggests.

THE COURT: Can I ask you something about - I'm sorry to interrupt, but I'm just looking at the dates of these various transactions. Is there relevance to the

1
2 dates, I mean when was, I see a bunch are Holy Land
3 Foundation, some Interpal, some others. Were any of
4 these Holy Land Foundation transactions after this
5 designation?

6 MR. RADINE: They were all after the Israeli
7 designation of Holy Land Foundation which we alleged was
8 publicized and, therefore, sufficient under *Honickman*.
9 They're not after the U.S. designation because that
10 would've prevented the correspondent banks from
11 processing these transactions.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So none of these are
13 post-U.S. designation?

14 MR. RADINE: Right, there wouldn't be U.S.
15 dollar transactions post-U.S. designations. So for HLF
16 that's the end of 2001, but for Interpal, of course,
17 that's 2003. And then some entities weren't designated.

18 THE COURT: Right, but you have Interpal
19 transactions from prior to the violence at issue.

20 MR. RADINE: Yeah. So anyway, the personal
21 jurisdiction, so obviously *Kaplan* and *Linde* make clear
22 that what constitutes routine banking is for a jury to
23 decide. Whether it's knowledge is sufficiently-or,
24 general awareness is sufficiently established from a
25 humanitarian purpose of a transactions is a merits

1 question that we'll obviously arrive to when we get into
2 merits discovery, but there's not been a court that's
3 held that a defendant's knowledge has to be evident on
4 the face of each transfer. That could be proven in any
5 number of ways.

7 THE COURT: At least for jurisdiction you're
8 saying.

9 MR. RADINE: At least for jurisdiction, right.
10 So arising out of, which is their argument is on the due
11 process version of "arising out of." There's the New
12 York version of "arising out of" and the due process
13 version. According to their letter, they're contesting
14 the due process version. Of course, as this Court noted,
15 they had not contested the New York "arising out of"
16 version in a motion to dismiss. In any event, the Second
17 Circuit has never, they note this in *Licci*, found a case
18 where plaintiff satisfied the New York rule but not the
19 due process rule.

20 As this Court noted, under the New York rule,
21 quote, "the foreign bank's use of its correspondent
22 accounts is not completely unmoored from the legal claim
23 regardless of the ultimate merits of the claim" is the
24 standard that Your Honor set out correctly. And then as
25 for whether the - whether due process could operate

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

10

differently, Your Honor noted, quote, "CAB offered no on-point case authority supporting this argument." The Second Circuit does not appear to have seen it either. So we think that's that for personal jurisdiction.

Now, we want to come to understand more about how the bank operated that we think bears on the transactional element and the documents they could have, and that's where the 30(b)(6) deposition notice comes in. And I can speak on that briefly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. RADINE: So we've noticed three issues to them. The first relates to the IT systems that the bank used during the relevant period as they relate to transaction processing. So they have explained to us before a little bit about their understanding of their systems at the time. They explained that they used the Kindle Banking System in the relevant period. That's been taken offline, and they don't have - the system is not supported anymore nor is the associated OS and hardware. And they mentioned they don't have backups and archives.

It's been our experience working with banks in these cases that what is not currently usable by the bank's IT staff is not necessarily unrecoverable.

1
2 Relevant data may sit on multiple systems, it may have
3 been transferred to another system, recovery may be
4 possible. It may necessitate a vendor who specializes in
5 recovery work. In any event, we won't know until we
6 ascertain what systems were used. I'd also point out
7 that that's a single system. So in our experience banks
8 use multiple systems. We've seen that the system that
9 runs the SWIFT database which its transactions are
10 processed through and other banks is not the same as
11 their core banking system which is what I believe the
12 Kindle system likely is. There may not be more to draw
13 from this line of inquiry, but we can't know until we
14 begin to have it.

15 The second issue is that of the CAB's use of
16 correspondent accounts and nested accounts. As Your
17 Honor raised at our last conference, it's worth knowing
18 how the bank used its correspondent accounts generally,
19 it gives a sense of the jurisdictional contacts they had
20 when processing the transactions. And then in the nested
21 account which is sub judice, the impact of that, in
22 *Spetner*, I would imagine the bank, just as much as us,
23 would like to know if CAB used its nested account in a
24 way that was similar or different than the defendant in
25 that case.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

12

THE COURT: And how did the defendant use the nested account in the cases pending before the Second Circuit?

MR. RADINE: So those transactions, when a customer of the bank wants to push a transaction, they will indicate who the ultimate beneficiary is. And then those are instructions that the originator bank, the defendant, would then give to their bank where they hold their nested account for further credit down the line ultimately through New York and then to the opposing party, the counterparty to the transaction.

So in a sense that when a bank holds a correspondent account in New York, when they send a transaction through New York, they're providing instructions to each bank down the line as to moving it along. This just adds another bank. So the question would be, for instance, like what control does the defendant have --

THE COURT: Why does it go through a nested account versus just going through its own, why would it add a party instead of minimize the parties?

MR. RADINE: So --

THE COURT: What's the purpose of being --

MR. RADINE: Sure, banks hold nested accounts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

13

for different reasons. That's something we'd certainly get into with them. Sometimes they're unable to hold, a New York bank won't offer them an account or at least an account with terms they want --

THE COURT: But we know that CAB did have some correspondent accounts.

MR. RADINE: Right. It could be a legacy account that they had from before they had access to New York accounts that they were still using. These are all things we would get into with them and see whether or not that's a fruitful topic to understand.

The last issue relates to their sale of relevant branches to Palestine Islamic Bank. They informed us that whatever records were at those branches in the Palestinian territories were transferred to the buyer bank when they bought those branches because possession, custody, and control can relate to whether or not you have the right to demand records back. We just want to understand what the agreement was as to those records, document sharing, however that operated, whether documents were transferred back to CAB at all.

Now, on these topics we have a corresponding set of document requests, we have four document requests that relate to these topics. CAB in a meet and confer told us

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

14

maybe those records will answer our questions without the need for deposition. We're, of course, open to that, to see those records and to see if that makes sense. We think we'd likely, at least from our experience in the IT process that we've gone through with other banks, I imagine we would have follow-up questions. But, of course, you know, we are happy to look at the documents first and talk to them about that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RADINE: So the big takeaway, Your Honor, is that between the continuing work of the banks that we've issued subpoenas to and the deposition process, we'd like to extend the discovery period. We propose 90 days in part to get us past the holidays from which we imagine we'll have a little bit less responsiveness from the banks and so on, and that would put us on February 2.

THE COURT: Right, well, we had November 14 as completion of jurisdictional discovery. So you want a 90-day extension on that.

MR. RADINE: Yeah, I think November 4 is the deadline, and the --

THE COURT: Maybe I have a typo in my notes.

MR. RADINE: Sure, November - so 90 days from November 4 would be February 2. Of course, we don't have

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

15

the Court's decision on the R&R, so our feeling is is that this is time we can use productively to do this work.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll hear from defendants next about these issues and also the extension of discovery.

MR. SIEGFRIED: Thank you, Your Honor. Dealing about nesting, which is in your mind at the moment, having looked at that chart, I don't want to - and you also said before you're not deciding merits --

THE COURT: No.

MR. SIEGFRIED: -- at a status conference. So I'm not going to argue a great deal about the merits other than to note a couple of things. One, the very beginning of their chart is replete with these so-called, what they're now calling, nesting transfers. Now, it's interesting actually because the plaintiffs like to keep changing their theory in this case. First of all, there's absolutely nothing in the complaint about nesting. In fact, as you may recall, what we brought to the Court's attention is that allegations in the complaint regarding these transfers, that they were all through Citibank, were incorrect when made, when the complaint was drafted. And then when you inquired of Mr.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

16

Osen about that issue when he was here, he said, oh, well, but we're not sure because the transfer slips don't necessarily show us whether it went through Citibank, and we don't have the complete transfer slips, so it may have gone through Citibank.

I gather they've now, because they should, have retreated from that argument to now talk about it as a nesting argument. And as far as a nesting argument is concerned, Your Honor, since they raised it and since I assume it will come up again, the case is *Spetner v. Palestinian Investment Bank*, 495 F. Supp. 3d 96, a 2020 decision, in which not just any plaintiff but these Plaintiffs represented by Mr. Osen and his firm, the same counsel that you have before you, made every conceivable argument under the sun to Judge, I think it's Komitee is, is that --

THE COURT: Who?

MR. SIEGFRIED: K-O-M-I-T-T --

THE COURT: Oh, Komitee.

MR. SIEGFRIED: Komitee. I don't know where you put the accent on that. Mad a whole bunch of arguments because the situation was even more involved than it is here. They had three different nesting theories. And he carefully reviewed each one, and he

1

PROCEEDINGS

17

2 said there was no personal jurisdiction. That is the law
3 as it stands right now. Mr. Radine is correct that they
4 have appealed to the Second Circuit. Obviously, I
5 wouldn't say anything about how you might judge the
6 matter, but I think that if you read the decision, it's a
7 fairly thorough, careful, detailed decision as to why
8 that theory simply doesn't hold water.

9 THE COURT: Of course, that's only with respect
10 to 17 transactions. The other ones are through --

11 MR. SIEGFRIED: And let's go to the others.

12 THE COURT: Yeah.

13 MR. SIEGFRIED: Then we have a whole bunch of
14 NatWest transactions that, of course, didn't go through
15 New York. A lot of them are in Sterling, some of them
16 are in (indiscernible), but they're not through Citibank
17 in New York. There are --

18 THE COURT: None of these are through New York?

19 MR. SIEGFRIED: No, I'm not saying that, Your
20 Honor. I've got a large sheet here, but I think that the
21 last time we looked, they keep making ongoing
22 productions, but the last time we looked, there were
23 maybe only a couple, two or three, that went through
24 Citibank. So, again, this is why, when I objected
25 before, I said there was much to be said about this.

1
2 Then we have issues regarding this contention by Mr.
3 Radine, by the plaintiffs, that this is somehow a merits
4 issue. Your Honor, we will have the opportunity
5 obviously to brief, and for you to consider, this issue,
6 but the Due Process clause, insofar as this is concerned,
7 is not a fifth grade math class in which you say how many
8 transfers were there and, therefore, oh, there must be
9 jurisdiction. Not any transaction will do.

10 The Due Process clause, and everyone from the
11 Supreme Court to the Second Circuit have been quite
12 clear, that the second part of this analysis, beyond the
13 number of transfers, which may be relevant to the issue
14 of purposefulness, the main part of due process is that
15 the claim must arise out of or relate to the transaction.
16 It's the nature of the transaction that is
17 extraordinarily important, and when we get to the merits
18 of this topic, we will address it, and, indeed, I think
19 you'll see that these claims do not, cannot relate to or
20 arise out of any of the transactions that they're listing
21 here.

22 You can - if it were otherwise, it would be the
23 case, I believe, that there'd be no distinction between
24 the maintenance of an account and a use account. It's
25 hard to imagine that anybody has a correspondent account

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

19

and doesn't use it. So the question is what is it using it for? What is the transaction? And that is where I think their case falls apart, and it is rather interesting if, and I think plaintiffs understand this because, quite frankly, if they had 110 transactions that really stood for what they would like to report in court today, then I'm not sure why we're going through seven more subpoenas to a whole bunch of banks or what further evidence they need other than what they have today.

So now let me turn to the rest of the - if I've answered that question.

THE COURT: Well, let me stop you for one second --

MR. SIEGFRIED: Sure.

THE COURT: -- because there's - I see here, looks like four transactions through New York in CAB's New York correspondent accounts involving use of Al-Hayek. If the court - so the ones from Bank One, from Texas, there's a bunch of those, and that's Holy Land Foundation was founded out of Texas. So I guess my question is sort of a do you, is it your position that if anything that the jurisdiction would be, or venue would be appropriate in Texas versus New York, assuming there was jurisdiction, assuming jurisdiction was established

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

20

through this correspondent bank accounts, how does that impact where this case is being litigated now?

MR. SIEGFRIED: It's --

THE COURT: Right? Because there's four New York and there's a lot of Texas. So, and if it were, if Texas were appropriate, do you want to be there versus is this a more convenient venue for everyone? I mean how does that factor into the analysis?

MR. SIEGFRIED: I would say New York is not a convenient factor nor is Texas for purposes of a foreign bank, and I'd rather, instead of responding off the cuff to your comment, come back to you on it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SIEGFRIED: But I think that, I don't think we really get there because whether we talk about, as I said, those Hayek transactions, which I cannot believe ultimately you will find differently than Judge Komitee has, or with respect to these Bank One transactions which also have issues around them, quite frankly, separate and apart from their use. I don't think we're going to end up reaching that issue. I just don't think they're jurisdictionally sufficient either for purposes of Texas or for New York, quite frankly.

THE COURT: Okay. You can address the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

21

remaining issues.

MR. SIEGFRIED: Okay, thank you. And, by the way, I should add, Your Honor, or maybe the last point I should make is we did have a meet and confer with Mr. Osen in which he said, well, we'd like you to confirm the content of the transactions, and, frankly, I'll have that conversation further with him offline. I don't actually understand the question, what the content of the transaction is.

THE COURT: Well, I assume they want to know do you dispute that these transactions actually occurred with these parties on these dates.

MR. SIEGFRIED: If that's what they're asking now, it has its own set of issues. So we'll have that discussion with them.

With respect to the subpoenas, you know, at the August 25 hearing, you set the deadline of November 4, and you said I want you to really focus on the jurisdictional issues. And Mr. Osen said in response, well, with respect to jurisdictional discovery, the deadline for third-party banks, we'll obviously abide by that. You asked for the status of discovery at that point, he gave you the status of discovery, there was not a word mentioned about, oh, we want to issue more

1
2 subpoenas. There wasn't - then we have somewhere
3 between, somewhere in the middle of September to late
4 September, I'm not even sure they say they served them
5 during that period. I know that the subpoenas are dated.
6 But supposedly they served something knowing what your
7 discovery deadline was, and these subpoenaed banks are
8 not any of the correspondent banks in New York. They're
9 not referred to in the complaint which identified the
10 correspondent accounts. So this is - so we have
11 subpoenas going out to seven banks, close to within a
12 month or so of your discovery deadline, to banks which,
13 with whom we do not have any correspondent account in New
14 York. And the subpoenas, as I read them, are for in each
15 case 23 years of records and for 74 or more individuals
16 and entities, notwithstanding the fact that the complaint
17 that is before us talks about five individuals and 16 --

18 THE COURT: So the subpoenas are covering more
19 than what's mentioned in the complaint?

20 MR. SIEGFRIED: Absolutely, and, Your Honor, if
21 you look at the joint status report, what you see in the
22 plaintiff's section is that, I think the term they use is
23 BNY, Bank of New York, has balked at the request for 23
24 years of, I don't know whether they say the 23 years, but
25 balked at the request, that they rejected multiple

1
2 compromises, and they only hope that it can be resolved
3 without judicial intervention.

4 In the meet and confer I asked Mr. Osen whether
5 the Bank of New York had any position as to whether it
6 even had documents going back to the relevant time
7 period, and I believe he told me that at least for the
8 Bank of New York, he said we don't even know that we have
9 them going back that far. Citibank had no documents,
10 none, zero, there's none produced by them. And Standard
11 Charter, the earliest document that they have that
12 involves CAB, a CAB transfer, is 2005.

13 So the idea that seven subpoenas are now going
14 out for this breadth, one thing for sure, if Your Honor
15 is inclined to let this part of it go forward and to
16 extend on this basis, we certainly don't want to be back
17 here in 30 days, 60 days, or 90 days hearing that there
18 are yet another six subpoenas or that we are still in
19 negotiation trying to get records from banks over a 23-
20 year period, etc.

21 And that's relevant to another point regarding
22 this chart and to what's happened today. There was a,
23 what seems to have happened with some of these banks, it
24 happened with Standard Charter, happened with HSBC with
25 whom also CAB had no correspondent account, is when they

1
2 get the subpoena, which, yes, it says transactions with
3 CAB, then has a list of 74 individuals for 23 years. As
4 a practical matter, I think we all know what the bank
5 does. It takes the list, the exhibit B list and it
6 produces documents, transactions involving where those
7 identified entities appear. So for HSBC which did
8 something like five productions over the last couple of
9 months, and produced a lot of documents, not a single one
10 refers to CAB.

11 So this subpoena of the seven banks seems to be,
12 as a reason for extension, seems to rest on a rather thin
13 reed. Again, we want to get past this discovery, we want
14 to get this motion, we think it's a good motion based
15 upon everything we've seen. So if Your Honor's inclined
16 to give them some leeway, we understand, but we certainly
17 - this starts to become a real stretch late in the game
18 to try to develop evidence.

19 On the - with respect to the 30(b)(6), again, I
20 thought we had a very practical conversation in the meet
21 and confer with Mr. Osen who, in all fairness, was the
22 only one who spoke at the meet and confer, but it's
23 curious because you had directed that we provide
24 plaintiffs with a letter regarding the sale of the
25 branches --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SIEGFRIED: -- regarding the IT platforms.

I think at one point there was an exchange where you asked Mr. Osen something to the effect of and what is the source codes or what's the operating systems going to have to do with all of this. But we provided that information. We provided that information, as Mr. Osen acknowledged last time, back in July about the sale, about the fact we didn't have transaction records, with respect to the system. It wasn't terribly vague. It said the bank is currently using Temenos, T-E-M-E-N-O-S, T24 Core Banking System under IBM UNIX OS. The system was implemented during the period 2011 to 2013. The prior operating system was the Kindle Banking System. The bank cancelled the license in 2013. The Kindle System is not supported anymore nor is the associated OS and hardware.

Now, that's on July 29 they had that information. On Sunday evening, October, if I'm off by a date, October 7 or 8, Sunday evening, they serve a 30(b)(6) deposition notice. Between July and October there is no follow-up, there's no request for any documents relating to those issues. And I asked Mr. Osen, number one, why would this be an efficient way to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

26

proceed. I said if I come in with a 30(b)(6) witness in 2022 about a system that hasn't been in effect since 2013, regarding documents that are no longer retained, that's not supported, that was a licensed system, and the witness says what do you want me to tell you, I said then you're going to tell me I gave you the wrong 30(b)(6) witness.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. SIEGFRIED: So the point is, I said why don't we - and I can't even tell you that we have the documents, right, this is, again, a conversation that occurred at the end of last week. If we had the documents, we'll give them to him --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SIEGFRIED: -- and if he wants to go run off to some expert and ask some expert, well, if that's what they had and it was under a license and they no longer have the thing, can you, I don't know what you can do, but in any event somebody wants to say they think they want to revive a system that's no longer there --

THE COURT: You already confirmed that the data from the relevant time period was not transferred --

MR. SIEGFRIED: Absolutely.

THE COURT: -- from Kindle to your system, the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

27

current system, is that correct?

MR. SIEGFRIED: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, so what I'm hearing gives me concern, Mr. Radine, that what you're doing is outside of the scope of Rule 26(b) which confines discovery to information that's relevant to the claims and defenses and proportional to the needs of the case. Why would you be subpoenaing banks that, you know, with which CAB didn't have correspondent bank accounts? That doesn't make any sense.

And further why would CAB have knowledge about the Kindle system? Wouldn't the appropriate inquiry be of Kindle if it even still exists as to what's going on with its system and did it ever retain any information? I doubt that it would've retained sensitive banking information. I doubt that the bank, any bank would allow that. But isn't a proper inquiry of Kindle rather than CAB since it was merely licensing that program? I'm not really understanding what you're doing or looking for or why this is relevant to jurisdiction.

MR. RADINE: Sure, well, I'll take those in parts. I'll start with the banks. Right, those are not CAB's correspondent banks. Those are the banks that are on the other side of the transaction. Every --

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

28

THE COURT: Other side of what transaction? It seems like a fishing expedition, that you're just subpoenaing random banks with which CAB doesn't have any existing relationships to see, hey, did you ever have any kind of transaction that somehow made its way to CAB? I mean how is that going to jurisdiction?

MR. RADINE: Sure. So this chart, Your Honor, is consisting entirely of records produced by banks that they don't have a correspondent banking relationship with CAB except for the nested account at Arab Bank.

THE COURT: Right, but this is - what defendant is saying is this is not even helping you. It doesn't even have New York except for these four transactions with use of Al-Hayek.

MR. RADINE: I'm at a little bit of a loss as to what that means. So, again, just to walk through how this works. The - so let's look at the direct transfers that start on page 1, go to page 2. So the column, so the beneficiary bank in these is Cairo Amman Bank. You can see that in that column. And the beneficiary's correspondent bank is in the first column on page 2, 4, and 6. So in every --

THE COURT: Well, 1 of 6 goes with 2 of 6, is that right?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

29

MR. RADINE: Correct, so --

THE COURT: And so the originating bank we have, let's just take Holy Land Foundation with Texas because that's at least in the United States as opposed to the U.K. Okay? So the originating bank says Bank One Texas.

MR. RADINE: Right.

THE COURT: And then there's a blank for originator's correspondent bank.

MR. RADINE: Right.

THE COURT: And then - I'm just looking at the third line on page 1, and that says the beneficiary party is the Halul Zakat Committee, and the beneficiary bank is CAB. So that's, CAB didn't, as I understand it, didn't originate this transaction. It received money from Holy Land Foundation that was deposited into the account of its customer Halul Zakat Committee. Is that how I'm to interpret this?

MR. RADINE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RADINE: So --

THE COURT: And there's no intermediary --

MR. RADINE: No.

THE COURT: -- bank listed for this. Where is

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

30

New York in this picture?

MR. RADINE: That is in column, the first column on page 2. That is the, if you look at the column name, beneficiary's correspondent bank, it's beneficiary bank's correspondent bank. I believe that's clear --

THE COURT: Well, okay, so I don't think there's a dispute that CAB had a correspondent account with Citi. But this transaction - is this - I don't understand this transaction to have gone through Citi. Are you saying that it did go through Citi?

MR. RADINE: Yes --

THE COURT: You're saying that - are you saying that Bank One in Texas transferred the money to Citi in New York, then transferred the money to CAB in wherever this was, Lebanon or Israel or some place, where?

MR. RADINE: Yeah. There's not a word on this that's our assumption. The bank would've done it through their correspondent account. That means on the face of the transfer record that we have that it says Citibank New York for further credit of Cairo Amman Bank, Hebron, etc. That's true for every single one of these transactions. In fact, it's wherever a document might be missing a piece of information, we might have a blank, but in every instance these are coming through the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

31

Citibank account. That's in the beneficiary's correspondent bank column, in every single instance. Some of them are through Amex in New York.

THE COURT: So the - so Holy Land Foundation says, hey, we want to send money to Halul Zakat Committee, and they say, well, our account is at CAB in Lebanon, and so NatWest initiates it and it gets deposited. And what I'm hearing CAB say is how is it engaging in anything volitional I guess, simply receiving the money through this mechanism.

MR. RADINE: Yes, Your Honor already ruled on that issue --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. RADINE: -- and held correctly that under Arcapita and Amigo Foods receiving a transaction rather than rejecting it qualifies as volitional for personal jurisdiction purposes.

All of the transactions, including all the NatWest ones, I don't know why he's suggesting otherwise, went through New York. Again, you can see the NatWest ones because they say NatWest in the originator bank, and then if you look at the corresponding row in the beneficiary's correspondent bank where it says Citi throughout, that's not an assumption we're making. We're

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

32

taking that off of the transaction records we have.

THE COURT: I see, so --
(interposing)

THE COURT: So for the U.K., just taking the first, well, just taking the first NatWest Interpal transaction, so NatWest in the U.K., Interpal says we want to give money to the Beit Fajjar's Zakat Committee -
-

MR. RADINE: Yes.

THE COURT: So they, NatWest then goes through NatWest U.K. --

MR. RADINE: Well, they had a branch in New York which is why I think it's not listed. So they would've cleared it themselves through New York. They would transfer it across the books of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York --

THE COURT: Oh, because it was U.S. dollar transaction --

MR. RADINE: Correct.

THE COURT: -- they go through their own U.S. account and then switch it to Citi. Oh, no, here they switch it to Amex Bank.

MR. RADINE: Yes.

THE COURT: And then to CAB where the recipient

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

33

has the account.

MR. RADINE: Correct. This is the same structure as in *Licci*, precisely. In fact, Amex is the exact correspondent bank in *Licci*.

MR. SIEGFRIED: Your Honor, may I jump in for one second --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SIEGFRIED: -- because it's relevant to your question.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SIEGFRIED: We didn't have a correspondent account at Amex. So the very first example that you're using is NatWest has actually -- I'll back up for one second and try not to get into merits of the argument. But NatWest either chose, for whatever reason, to send the transfer through Amex, fine, but that has nothing to do with us, or sometimes, Your Honor, under the system that actually happens under Swift, the bank, as I think you probably know, doesn't even make the originating bank, NatWest in this case, for an Interpal transaction, doesn't even make the decision. It puts it into Swift, and the Swift computers do whatever they do --

THE COURT: System just does its stuff.

MR. SIEGFRIED: -- and they send something

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

34

through. So I don't see how that gets to be the volitional use of a correspondent, of its correspondent account in New York.

THE COURT: But you did have a correspondent account with Citi.

MR. SIEGFRIED: We did have a correspondent account with Citi, but I think the way we got into this line of questioning was you posed a simple question which is with respect to these seven new subpoenas that they want to serve which are not to the CAB correspondent banks, what is the relevance of that, why is that a Rule 26(b) request --

THE COURT: Right, right.

MR. SIEGFRIED: -- and I'm actually not sure I heard the answer to that question.

THE COURT: Yes, well, let's go back to that, Mr. Radine, what is the relevance?

MR. RADINE: Sorry, if I just - I want a, just a clean record. A bank can't force a transaction through an intermediate bank that doesn't have a correspondent relationship. Of these seven transactions with Amex - I don't know sitting here, the story, what appears to be the case is they did have a correspondent account with that bank. Sitting here I don't know. We're pulling

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

35

this from the face of the transaction. We've been through the - that's not something I think is controversial or obviously --

THE COURT: Well, it is because CAB is saying they didn't have a correspondent bank with, they didn't have a correspondent banking relationship with Amex or here's Bank of New York --

MR. RADINE: Bank of New York I think they concede. But, Your Honor, this sounds like grounds all the more to have a 30(b)(6) because they're denying having an account that we have on paper. They're denying it here in court. It's not under oath. It's a great question to ask them in a 30(b)(6) context.

THE COURT: Okay, but that answers the question about why you might want to have a 30(b)(6), you might want to have a witness explain what the different relationships were, but that doesn't go to the subpoenas onto these other banks.

MR. RADINE: So these are banks that we understand would be likely on the other side of the transactions because they are, for instance, either the biggest players in the markets where a lot of these Hamas affiliated entities are or because we have other records that have attached them to entities like that. They have

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

36

not moved, of course, to quash.

THE COURT: So you're trying to get reverse information essentially.

MR. RADINE: Sure, this whole chart --

THE COURT: These other banks - so these other - you are speculating that these other banks have accounts with Hamas entities, not all of which are even listed in your complaint, and those entities might have asked their banks to send money to somebody who had an account with Cairo Amman Bank. So it sounds like a fishing expedition is really what it sounds like.

MR. RADINE: Or they're the correspondent bank for - they don't have to have the accounts themselves. They can also be in a correspondent position. These banks have New York branches which is why --

THE COURT: But you don't know, as you sit here today, whether - you don't know who the customers of these subpoena recipients are or whether they ever initiated a banking transaction that went to a customer of CAB. You don't even know that.

MR. RADINE: But these banks are the choke points essentially, rather than, for instance, subpoenaing all 10,000 banks in Germany, you have Commerzbank, the largest sort of clearing bank for

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

37

Germany, and I believe we recently got a transaction hit on that. So so far it's been productive.

THE COURT: You got one hit out of how many subpoenas and how many records and years? I mean this is really excessive it seems, and really how are you going to demonstrate jurisdiction through this?

MR. RADINE: I'm not sure how it's to the defendant's prejudice that we reach out with subpoenas. They've produced nothing --

THE COURT: Well, the prejudice is they keep coming into court. They're waiting to brief the jurisdictional issue on the merits as opposed to under a Rule 12 standard, and they're spending attorney's fees involving this, and then they're going to have to prepare a witness for a 30(b)(6) deposition on a topic that it seems, I don't know understand why they would have any knowledge of it at all. Why would they have knowledge on this other company's system that they no longer use?

MR. RADINE: I'll turn to the 30(b)(6) thing. My understanding is, first, a party can't object to the relevance of a subpoena. That's something that the subpoena recipient --

THE COURT: Well, that is true, but at the same time you're asking for an extension of discovery based on

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

38

that, and you are bound by Rule 26(g) and 26(b) to seek discovery that is consistent with the rules relevant to the claims and defenses and proportional to the needs of the case. So, yes, that is true that CAB may not have standing to object on relevance grounds, but you as an officer of the court have an obligation to utilize the Federal Rules consistent with what they say.

MR. RADINE: So far, Your Honor, we have only gotten records from third-party banks that don't have a correspondent relationship with CAB. If we didn't have access to records like those, we'd be at zero instead of 101 on this list right here. We are meeting and conferring with those banks, we take their objections seriously, and work on narrowing the subpoena with each of them. They're obviously free to move to quash, but so far we've had productive conversations with them, and some of them have been producing already, some are still working on it, as he mentioned, Standard Chartered Bank, which, by the way, owned Amex or now owns Amex Bank, (indiscernible) that bank, produced records that went back to '05. We're obviously asking them to look back further.

I don't think with the defendant producing nothing that we shouldn't be allowed to reach out to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

39

banks that we have at least a reason to believe can run a search --

THE COURT: What is the reasonable belief? It sounds - you're not even including entities that are mentioned in the complaint.

MR. RADINE: The company, Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: It's really speculation. Has somebody told you, oh, Standard Chartered has an account with this particular entity that's listed in the complaint, has somebody told you that?

MR. RADINE: They're likely to be - well, they're likely to be, to have the role rather of a correspondent bank. We subpoenaed their New York branches for each of these banks rather than casting about around the world. There's only so many banks which do dollar clearing at all, and any transaction from around the world that comes through their bank for dollar clearing is something that they would have a record of or at least would have had a record of at the time. So --

THE COURT: Yes, that may all be true, but it is still speculation that you're going to have a hit on anything that is relevant.

MR. RADINE: And as for the list - well, I think, Your Honor, that we are, again, targeting a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

40

limited set of banks that we think have the most likelihood of being in that position. Obviously, the names are names that we understand as Hamas customers and entities. We didn't understand the complaint has a necessity to be a directory of every Hamas operative or entity. That's something that expands during discovery that we are seeking with those banks.

If I could turn to the deposition --

MR. SIEGFRIED: Your Honor, sorry, can I jump in on that for a moment? Apart from everything you've just said, the last statement is an extraordinary statement. So your - we are arguing or will be arguing that the Court doesn't have personal jurisdiction with respect to the claims asserted in the complaint. This was no tiny complaint. This was a very long complaint which listed five individuals, sixteen or seventeen entities, a lot of detail about it. And now the argument is, well, we think there may be some banks out there, we know they're not the correspondent accounts, they may have had customers or sent money to 70 some odd other individuals, and maybe we'll find a hit that actually went through CAB. And then what? So they did a transfer to somebody who's not even in the complaint. So now they're going to argue, well, that's a Hamas person and,

1

PROCEEDINGS

41

2 therefore, there's jurisdiction even though those persons
3 and entities aren't referenced in the complaint.

4 And this is all coming, we haven't heard, A,
5 when they, whether they even effected the service. This
6 is all coming close to your discovery deadline when they
7 said they would abide by the discovery deadline. And it,
8 you know, I don't normally want to use the word fishing
9 expedition, I'm glad that you did, in this circumstance,
10 but this is the problem, and, again, when we get into
11 this chart eventually, you'll see that, I mean there are
12 transfers to entities that they refer to aren't, again,
13 aren't in the complaint.

14 So I understand they want to use the
15 jurisdictional discovery to do all kinds of things, but
16 that's not what this is about. The 30(b)(6), again, what
17 I said, I'm not even sure why that's a 30(b)(6). If what
18 they want is a representation or a statement as to who
19 the correspondent accounts were, we could do that. That
20 hardly requires a 30(b)(6) deposition to do that.
21 Actually, Mr. Osen said I will work with you efficiently
22 on that.

23 But I think you're getting a sense of the
24 problem that we have. This is costly, this is, we're not
25 the ones who brought an action 22 years after the events.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

42

They're stuck with the fact that having waited so long,
these banks don't have records --

THE COURT: Well, to be fair, the law changed,
and --

MR. SIEGFRIED: And it's within --

THE COURT: -- allowed the aiding and abetting
claim.

MR. SIEGFRIED: It does, but to be equally
fair, these plaintiffs, it's not just any plaintiff,
these plaintiffs sued Arab Bank, they sued NatWest, they
sued Credit Lyonnais. It's the same plaintiffs, the same
claims, the same attacks, the same injuries. They just
discovered 20 years after the fact CAB?

So they get the discovery, they have their
complaint. But it has to be - this is why we're pushing
back. Again, we want to be reasonable, but we don't want
to be doing this months and months. And there's an
additional prejudice, as I said, which is it is costly
because when they go and they subpoena somebody like
HSBC, as I used as an example before, HSBC produces
thousands of pages of documents which we then have to
review.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SIEGFRIED: And for nothing, for zero, zero

1 transactions.

2
3 THE COURT: Well, it seems to me that there's
4 really not a basis to extend discovery by 90 days. I'll
5 extend discovery to December 9. And if you are seeking
6 to move to compel compliance with these subpoenas, those
7 have to be filed in November by November 11, any motions
8 to compel.

9 MR. RADINE: Okay. Did Your Honor want to be
10 address the 30(b)(6) statements discussion?

11 THE COURT: Well, for the 30(b)(6) you all
12 still have to meet and confer. It sounds like you're not
13 done with that process from what I've heard, and I
14 understand why you may want some testimony about exactly
15 how the correspondent banking relationship worked, have
16 something under oath about what were the correspondent
17 banking relationships at the relevant time period. So I
18 understand that, but it seems to me that you can further
19 meet and confer on that.

20 MR. RADINE: That's fine. We heard a number of
21 inaccuracies about the description of the IT systems and
22 so on, but that can be the subject of the meet and confer
23 process.

24 THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not limiting right now
25 the 30(b)(6) topics. I'm just expressing some skepticism

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

44

about the need for some of the topics, but you should still meet and confer on those. Because it seems to me there's a real question of what was happening with some of these transactions that you're listing here. I mean how many of these transactions even involve entities listed in the complaint?

MR. RADINE: I believe this list should correspond to the complaint. I don't --

THE COURT: Obviously, I recognize some of the names.

MR. RADINE: Yeah, I mean Holy Land Foundation is on most of, a lot of these. Interpal is on a lot. I think there'd be very few that aren't.

THE COURT: Right, but the point is what does CAB have to do with it? So what if Holy Land Foundation has an account with Bank One in Texas? What does that have to do with CAB? The question is is it going to, in these transactions, is it going to a CAB client that is mentioned in the complaint? That would be relevant. So my question is really the beneficiary parties because that's what we're looking at here, what the beneficiary parties, how many of these are named in the complaint? Has anybody taken stock of that?

MR. RADINE: Sure. I can tell you I see mostly

1

PROCEEDINGS

45

2 look in the beneficiary column, Your Honor, I see, again,
3 mostly, a lot of Holy Land Foundation. The Zakat
4 Committees were all in the complaint, I'm sure of that.
5 Taha's in the complaint, Mohamed Salah Taha is in the
6 complaint. So I don't see, excuse me, any, yeah, I don't
7 know about every single one, but it looks like the
8 overwhelming - Al-Mujama is the central headquarters
9 institution of Hamas. So I think that would certainly
10 qualify. WAMY is in the complaint. I don't see any that
11 aren't, which isn't to say my eyes aren't skipping over
12 one looking at this list now, and obviously I don't
13 understand the law to suggest that evidence that's
14 outside the complaint isn't sufficient on summary
15 judgment. Discovery often will --

16 THE COURT: Well, it has to be - discovery has
17 to be relevant to the claims and defenses, and so, yes,
18 discovery may involve information that's not included,
19 facts that are not included in the complaint, but they
20 still have to be facts relevant to the claims and
21 defenses. So that's the limitation.

22 MR. SIEGFRIED: I might be able to help Mr.
23 Radine out with his eyes on page 2 which is going no
24 further than page 2. The Halul Zakat Committee is not
25 mentioned in the complaint. The Silwad Municipality is

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

46

not mentioned in the complaint --

THE COURT: Okay. Well, there's some and there's some not. Okay.

MR. SIEGFRIED: Exactly.

THE COURT: So this is supposed to be related to jurisdiction as opposed to this general awareness which may potentially be slightly broader, and that's what you're, that's the - so it sounds to me like maybe some of these subpoenas are going beyond jurisdictional discovery and going into potentially this general awareness element. There's some argument that you don't want to subpoena banks twice if they're going to look for documents. At the same time it seems like they're quite broad.

I'm going to direct you to meet and confer on the Rule 30(b)(6). I'm not going to extend jurisdictional discovery any further beyond the December 11 date.

MR. RADINE: December 11?

THE COURT: Isn't that what I said?

ATTORNEY: December 9.

THE COURT: December 9, sorry. November 11 is the date for any motions to compel. And I'll issue an order with that revised schedule. Are there other items

1
2 that plaintiffs wanted to raise today?

3 MR. RADINE: I believe that is it for us, Your
4 Honor.

5 THE COURT: Anything else defense counsel would
6 like to raise? Yes.

7 MR. SIEGFRIED: The one item that you didn't
8 touch upon, but I mention it not for purposes of a ruling
9 because it falls under the meet and confer issue that Mr.
10 Osen and I agreed to have, but which Mr. Radine also
11 raised at least tangentially today, regarding witnesses.
12 I asked Mr. Osen, since he has the burden of proof once
13 you have jurisdictional discovery. To make out his
14 jurisdictional argument, I asked him whether he saw this
15 as a documents case and then the law as applied to the
16 documents, or whether he saw this as a case in which he
17 would require, in which he anticipated or potentially
18 anticipated using witness testimony, whether it's by
19 affidavit, deposition, whatever.

20 And when I first raised it several weeks ago or
21 over a month ago, He said he hadn't really given it any
22 thought, let him think about it, he understood the issue.
23 When we had the meet and confer, I raised it again
24 because we had received a letter in the interim that,
25 well, we don't know what to put in until we see your

1 papers, and we wrote back you have the burden of proof.
2 It's not a question of what we put in; it's a question of
3 what, because we have the right to depose a person if
4 you're planning to call a witness. And it's your burden.
5 You're going to set forth the facts that you think are
6 relevant and why you think any transactions that the bank
7 may have engaged in through New York relate to, or that
8 your claims arise or relate to those transactions.
9

10 So we in the meet and confer, I think Mr. Osen
11 said he was inclined to believe that this was going to be
12 a documents and law case, that's fine. We agreed to talk
13 about it further. But I just wanted to put that on your
14 radar because clearly if we don't have an agreement about
15 that, I don't think this is all about hiding the ball.
16 This is about --

17 THE COURT: No, you have to have an exchange of
18 information and perhaps there's going to be testimony
19 from a 30(b)(6) witness about some of these transactions
20 on the sheet or, I don't know, maybe somebody from one of
21 these banks. I assume there's no dispute that these are
22 authentic records produced by the bank or the bank will
23 say these are real records that they have, but you may
24 dispute the, what they mean. But that would be the
25 subject of testimony potentially, how they are

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS

49

interpreted.

Okay, well, I'm --

MR. SIEGFRIED: I don't think there's an authentication issue with respect to anything that's been subpoenaed.

THE COURT: Yes, right.

MR. SIEGFRIED: But --

THE COURT: Okay, so I'm just going to put a pin on that and ask you to meet and confer, and I think we do have a date for a next conference. Is that right, Chris? We do, okay. All right, well, have a Happy Halloween, everyone. Nice to see you. We're adjourned.

MR. SIEGFRIED: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: November 15.

THE COURT: November 15, okay, well, then that's good because if there's any motions to compel, we'll know. You can invite the banks to that, if there are any motions to compel, you can invite the banks to that conference. Okay? Thank you.

(Whereupon the matter was adjourned to November 15, 2022.)

1

PROCEEDINGS

50

2

3

4

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Carole Ludwig, certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, Averbach, et al. versus Cairo Amman Bank, Docket #19cv0004, was prepared using digital electronic transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Signature _____

CAROLE LUDWIG

Date: October 26, 2022